DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 428 022 SO 029 953

AUTHOR Marshall, Catherine
TITLE Critical Feminist Policy Analysis: Toward Demanding and Disrupting Policy Analyses.
PUB DATE 1998-04-14
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Diego, CA, April 13-17, 1998).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Critical Theory; Cultural Context; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Feminist Criticism; *Policy Analysis; Power Structure; *Public Schools; *Research Methodology; *Sex Fairness; Social Studies
IDENTIFIERS Educational Issues; *Gender Issues

ABSTRACT

This paper asserts that whether the issue is teen pregnancy, sexual harassment in schools, or the underutilization of women's leadership in schools, little funding goes to research or programs putting women at the center of these issues. At first glance, the deliberations of school boards, deans, judges, lawmakers, and professional associations appear as orderly, rules-driven, decision making informed by estimates, evaluations, and technical analyses provided by experts. The central thrust of the federal policies for gender equality was opening access to white male domains. Title IX "sounds" impressive, but to this date only 11% of school superintendents are female, there is still sexual harassment in schools, and disproportionately high expenditures for football programs for boys exist along with under funded extracurricular programs that girls can participate in. Deeper analysis is needed to develop stronger policy centered on women. Critical theorists place at the center of analysis the power, policies, and structures that resist access. Insiders in policy debates are creating the master narrative, so that the analyst (an outsider) must identify the value-laden and various interpretations of those insiders, studying policies from the inside, uncovering evaluative presumptions and "policy makers theoretical premises and actions." Feminist theory-driven questioning will not only inform gender equity issues, it will expand the questions, models, and methods--demonstrating openings for a rich and democratizing agenda for education policy analysts to embrace, demanding that these issues be included in all policy analyses: gender, the public sphere and master narratives; counter-publics' policy issues; state intervention; "outing" symbolic policy and simplistic tendencies; the historical and comparative perspective and the effects of political/economic shifts; moving beyond essential labels; and critiquing bureaucracy, leadership, power, and community. To expand research methodologies, feminist theory-driven questions must be employed. (Contains 12 notes and 68 references.) (BT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 428 022

Critical Feminist Policy Analysis: Toward Demanding and Disrupting Policy Analyses[1]

Catherine Marshall
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Catherine Marshall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SO 029 953

Paper presented to the American Eudcational Research Association
April 14, 1998
San Diego, California

[1] For an expanded version of these points, please see Feminist & Critical Policy Analysis by C. Marshall, 1997.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Imagine a government and research foundations framing policy studies and research for education with feminist goals. Would they create competition, separation by gender? Formal and informal curricula telling boys and girls that white males are center stage and that the public sphere (e.g. government and the marketplace) should be kept separate from the private concerns of family, emotion, values, and community--and that is the way it should be? Would they want girls exposed to an unwritten curriculum of white male privilege? Would they set up schools with employment models and patterns of interactions that demonstrate that females should have lower pay and authority or that sexual harassment occurs just because "boys will be boys"? Would they support the adoration of the male body (sports) with the cutest females cheering on this adoration? (Weis, 1995, p.15). Would 89% of the top leaders be men? (Marshall, 1997c). Would we allow adults with low expectations for girls near this place? No, not in Herland. But our existing politics, policies, programs, research funding, and policy studies have ignored or marginalized the feminist critique.

Whether the issue is teen pregnancy or sexual harassment in schools or the under-utilization of women's leadership in schools, -- all documented "problems" -- little funding goes to research or programs putting women at the center of these issues.

What Goes on in the Policy Arena?

The visible, authorized, formal, legitimized arenas hold the positions and power to decide priorities for schools: school boards, official task forces, deans, judges, professional associations, certification standards boards, lawmakers, reform commissions, code books. Front-of-the-scenes actions set directions for numbers of minutes devoted to national history, for sex education, for minimum standards for schools' computer capacities and wheelchair accessibility. They decide whether single sex schools are valuable. They decide how schools should address the needs of immigrant children. On first glance, their deliberations appear as orderly, rules-driven, decisionmaking informed by estimates, evaluations, and technical analyses provided by experts.

Policy Efforts for Gender Equity

The central thrust of the federal policies for gender equality was opening access to white male domains--a limited liberal agenda. Title IX sounds impressive but we still have only 11% of superintendents female, still have sexual harassment in schools, still have disproportionately high expenditures for football programs for boys and unequal extracurricular programs which girls can participate in. Deeper analysis is needed to ground deeper policy, centered on women.

Policy Context The wave-making education reform documents of the 80's commanded national and state attention to improve schools' performance. They did not mention "girls at risk" in the "nation at risk" and, except for a few scholars and non-mainstream (malestream) researchers and policy bureaucrats, nobody noticed (Tetrault & Schmuck, 1985; Sadker, Sadker, & Steindam, 1989; Klein, 1988; Glazer, 1991). The policy culture did not countenance interventions to alter the patterns in schooling that reproduce inequitable gender relations. Nor did the policy culture countenance interventions that reconceptualized gender constructions, definitions of family life,

and revalued women's work. Gender and power relations in the workplace and personal relationships--the deeper assumptions undergirding gender issues--were not on the policy agenda.

How to Explain the Inattention?

Knowledge, laws, and traditions which developed in a public discourse dominated and peopled by white males has left us with constrained methods of policy analysis and "partial and perverse understandings" (Harding, 1986, p. 26) from limited theoretical and political frameworks--greatly in need of dismantling. Traditional policy analysis is "grounded in a narrow, falsely objective, overly instrumental view of rationality that masks its latent biases and allows policy elites and technocrats to present analyses and plans as neutral and objective when they are actually tied to prevailing relations of power" (Schram's 1995 review of Forester's stance, p. 375).

Cultural values and choices in policy arenas. Value acceptability, or how a given idea fits with national culture or ideology, affects how these values enter into policy decisions. "Policy windows"(Kingdon, 1984) open to these acceptable values because of a change in the political stream (a change of administration, a shift in Congress or national mood); or because a new problem captures the attention of policymakers. Thus, Sputnik opened policy windows for math and science curriculum policy but no such window opened for government-supported curricula for prevention of violence toward women.

Policy communities, assumptive worlds, and logical frames. Policy issues are constrained by the "assumptive worlds" of policy actors--their understandings about how to act and talk, about who initiates action, and what are the limits on policy options (Marshall, Mitchell, & Wirt, 1989). "Logics," "models" or "frameworks" are an important unit of analysis in public policy for probing policy makers' thoughts (Anderson, 1978; Rein, 1983). They are the basis for policy formulation as well as "standards of how to judge and criticize policymaking performance," and have the power to offer different definitions of what is real and important. Thus, policy analyses can identify how, for example, legislators attend to a gender policy for girls in math but declare inappropriate any policy discussion of power/sexuality dynamics in sex education curricula.[1]

The public sphere, agenda-setting, and masternarratives. Patriarchal traditions and state apparatuses structured around the economic market affect policy agendas, determining whether or not a problem is on the public agenda, part of public discourse and possible state intervention, or whether it is marginal or belongs to the private--the world of the individual or the domestic and emotional (e.g. do governments interfere with industrial pollution, with teenagers' decisions to get abortions; do governments shape girls' career choices by influencing school curricula?).

Power resides in knowledge that has legitimacy (Foucault, 1981). Debates over education policy are power conflicts over which knowledge is the "truth." Power is enacted by control of knowledge. Those whose control the discourse discredit or marginalize other "truths". Thus, debates over required curriculum, the canon, the requirements for professional credentials--are power/knowledge struggles. Some ideas gain the momentum, legitimacy, and support to become dominant enough to get an audience in a policy system, and then, perhaps, to become a law, a program, a budget priority, a mission statement, a curriculum component. A focus on language

shows how ideas, preferences and values attain the stature of statute. Ball evokes the controlling power by saying, "we do not speak the discourse. The discourse speaks us" (1990, p.18) by constructing only limited possibilities for thought. People use speech as a power tool--to create power, to effect a desire or goal, and to block, resist, and create opposing strategies (Foucault, 1981; Ball, 1990). Privileged speakers' truths (and policy analyses) prevail; a "discourse of derision" can be used to displace or debunk alternative truths (Ball, 1990). Thus, some ideas get silenced.

The appeal of traditional policy analysis: Traditional policy analysis tries to identify and calculate effects of policies with apolitical, objective, neutral methods. Seeing social problems as diseases which have real causes and need real and/or symbolic solutions, they endeavor to assist and they assess the merits and efficacy of solution-implementations (Scheurich, 1994). This is appealing and fits with a dominant liberal optimism of educators and policymakers--an assumption that there will be decisionmakers that will assess, formulate, and fund policies and programs that hold clear promise to promote a clearly defined and agreed-upon purpose.

WHAT TO DO?FEMINIST AND CRITICAL THEORY AND THE POLICY ARENA

Connecting Feminist Analysis to Power and Policy

"The state is a site of contestation not only between different groups, but also different views of masculinity and femininity" (Blackmore, 1989, p. 12). "Gender and its regulation is not just an afterthought in state policy" (Apple, 1994, p. 356) and schools' functions as the institution for socialization should rivet policy makers' and analysts' attention to the gender messages in schools. Research on gender equity must connect equity policy to the power, the force, direction, and impact of cultural values that drive all policy (MacKinnon, 1989; Arnot, 1993; Weiler, 1993; Eisenstein, 1993; Ortiz & Marshall, 1988; Marshall & Anderson, 1995).

Interpretive and narrative policy analysis. Analysts with this knowledge will seek out the stories of all stakeholders. Such policy analysis includes systematic ways of eliciting such storytelling, especially "when the storytelling at issue has arisen in order to articulate those recognizably complex and uncertain issues that otherwise continue to defy adequate specification...(by) microeconomics, statistics, organizational analysis and the law" (Roe, 1989, p. 253). Further, analysts recognize asymmetries, power differentials among the stakeholders. As stakeholders' stories are competing, some stakeholders have easier access to economic and political power; for any group, their articulated stories are the tool, the method for gaining access to power (Roe, 1989).

Critical policy analysis. Critical theorists place at the center of analysis the power, policies and structures that restrict access; their work often demonstrates how privilege is maintained and the disempowered and silenced are kept that way, raising "serious questions about the role of schools in the social and cultural reproduction of social classes, gender roles, and racial and ethnic prejudice" (Anderson, 1989, p. 251).

Critical policy analysis, then, aims to improve the human condition. It is an emancipatory social science; analysts must assist in identifying more radical alternatives. Policy

analysts, then, must consider whether a policy will empower and democratize, whether it will dispense goods to the "have-nots" as much as they consider traditional questions such as whether a policy is efficient. Dryzek & Brobow (1987) envision policy analysis aimed toward wholesale reconstruction of political institutions and public life.

Purposeful policy studies. Once we see that policy systems, schools, and knowledge are the work benches for power tools, our social science pretenses of value neutrality are abandoned. Analysts must identify a purpose, a stance. Kahne calls for policy analysis that reconnects education systems with the creation of democratic community, starting with "the miniature community created within the school classroom" (1994, p. 239). Giroux calls for critical educators to have a radical politics of democracy in order "to work with other cultural workers in various movements to develop and advance a broader discourse of political and collective struggle" (1992, p. 42). He urges a move beyond theoretical postmodern and feminist discourse to "a project in which a politics of difference can emerge within a shared discourse of democratic public life" (p. 42).

Guides to reconstructed policy analysis. Policy analysts would have to pay attention to the policy deliberations, "including such processes as how decision premises are covertly built into decision structures are the ways in which non-decisions can preshape political agendas" (Fischer, 1989, p. 950) and the interests and values of the stakeholders "so that we can examine particularly ways that citizens are (or are not) able to speak and act politically, to question facts, rules, or stereotypical identities" (Forester, 1993, p. 130; DeLeon, 1988). Insiders in policy debates are creating the master narrative, so the analyst (an outsider) must identify the value-laden and various interpretations of those insiders, studying politics from the inside, uncovering evaluative presumptions and "policy makers' theoretical premises and actions" (DeHaven-Smith, 1988), their "manifest rationales" and the "normative standards and framework of reasoning of practitioners" (Anderson, 1978).

Power and Politics Feminisms identify the gender regime, hegemony; the grounding for their research, policy, and action is the political choices and power-driven ideologies and embedded forces that categorize, oppress and exclude. They identify the ways political systems can be societally constructed to institutionalize (e.g. in schools, legal precedents, job classifications) the inequities of gender, race, class and can solidify social injustices. As Apple says,

> "Gender and its regulation is not just an afterthought in state policy. Rather, it is a constitutive part of it. Nearly all of the state's activity is involved in it. One need only think of the following areas of state policy--family, population, housing, the regulation of sexuality, child care, taxation and income redistribution, the military, and what concerns us the most here, education---to see the role of the state in gender politics even when it is not overtly discussed in official documents" (Apple, 1994, p. 356).

presaging a rich agenda of theory building based on extensive analyses of gender-related policies.

FEMINIST CRITICAL POLICY ANALYSIS: EXPANDING POLICY QUESTIONS [2 3]

Feminist theory-driven questioning will not only inform gender equity issues, it will expand our questions, models and methods. It demonstrates openings for a rich and democratizing agenda for education policy analysts to embrace. Feminist critical policy analysis seeks ways to make our policy system more just, democratic and equitable, demanding that these expanded issues be included in all policy analysis:

Gender, the public sphere and masternarratives. Now we know to avoid being limited to the domination and control ideologies and apparatuses of the public arena. Widened definitions of public sphere and explications of counterpublics offer hope for alternative transformational discourse. We recognize the policy issues in people's everyday, lived, personal realities.[4]

Policy analysis and feminism intersect over questions about what is public and what is private and who decides: Thus, analyses of women administrators' negotiations to fit their identities into male-structured leadership norms (e.g. Blackmore, 1995; Marshall, 1985), feelings of exclusion and frustration over being unappreciated for nurturing, counseling, relationship-work are no longer private emotional women's problems but matters for analysis of public policy affecting women's place in education and critiques of masculinist legitimized science then become education policy analysis. Such critiques promise expansions that can break through limited, mechanistic, dehumanizing assumptions.[5]

Counterpublics' policy issues. Can there be policy analyses for non-dominants, for silenced issues, for marginalized populations? [6] Or is "feminist critical policy consultant" an oxymoron? What happens among subaltern counterpublics? What are the parallel discourses and counterdiscourses and opposing interpretations (Fraser, 1994, p. 123) that exist beyond the discourse in the public sphere? [7] What are the arrangements for setting up boundaries for public, dominant, legitimate discourse? These questions speak to basic questions about democracy; they can also help policy analysts ask about kids who drop out, girls who get pregnant, educators who only pretend to comply with policy directives from above, and parents who are cynical about participatory decisionmaking.

State intervention. For social justice, what is the role of the state? Can the state be relied upon for analyses of inequities?[8] What are the related issues that surface when gender is the policy issue? Examples of such issues are the debate over how much the state should intervene in family and private affairs and whether government should be satisfied with addressing (but not redressing) an equity issue, whether policy recommendations for small add-on fixes and identifying victims' deficiencies and providing compensatory supports. When you go to the state, you reaffirm the state's power to fix the problem, giving it further right to dominate you. Thus, girls are those to be done to, fixed.

So, feminist policy analysts worry over going to the formal, centralized state for redress.[9] Ferguson worries about being silenced by bureaucratic processes; Australian analysts have worried that the femocrats in their bureaucracies lost their radical determination when coopted by being put in high positions. Sometimes local and regional politics have thwarted feminist advances (the U.S. Equal Rights Amendment) but other times, state and local politics made up for national rescissions (e.g. for child care, battered women's shelters) (Boneparth & Stoper, 1988). Sometimes working the political system (lobbying, forming coalitions, attaining political

leadership) and court cases have helped women, but Boneparth and Stoper wonder whether this solidifies opposition and Faludi (1991) documents such backlash.

"Outing" symbolic policy and simplistic remedies. If language is the power tool of politics, analysts can focus on words and ask whether the words, in policy speeches and documents match with real outcomes. Feminist critical policy analyses see through symbolic inaction, [10] suspicious of policy actors' rhetoric and policies with no enforcement and reveal how symbolic policy can be harmful, like the placebo that gives only the pretence of treatment. Traditional policy recommendations for remedies will not be applied in vacuums, free of the power relations of race, class, gender (Ball, 1990). Therefore, typical recommendations and remedies (give scholarships, create add-on programs, threaten penalties) will often be inappropriate at least, and even damaging (by allowing symbolic policy to seem adequate or by leaving the burden of enforcement on the individual). For example, policies with gender-neutrality goals fail by ignoring the accumulation of advantage by males from extant cultural practices and institutions.

The historical and comparative perspective and the effects of political/economic shifts. Focused and decontextualized policy analyses often miss historical, economic, cultural contexts. They miss the political aspects of classroom dynamics limiting girls' access to computer terminals in third grade and legislators refusing to raise teacher pay. Analyses, for example, for teacher recruitment policy issues, can benefit from Michelle Foster's (1993) life histories of Black women teachers before desegregation for deeper understanding of policy effects. Analyses can benefit from, for example, Acker's (1994) and Biklen's (1995) emphasis on the fact that teachers are mostly women. Traditional policy analysis ignores gender structuring in education. And analysts benefit by looking beyond education, for example, at Ferguson (1984) and Cockburn (1991) on organizational life, for a cross-organizational comparison of how opportunity structures and bureaucratic processes affect women's opportunity.

Moving beyond essentialing labels. Statisticians are fond of neat categories: by sex, age, SES, and so on. Critical feminist analysis insists upon recognition of complexity--that the categories are mixed, have many elements that make up whole beings, and are not static but evolve. Analyses and recommendations, therefore, cannot simply aim at some universal target to fix the woman thing. Thus, labels like Latina, postmenopausal, high achiever, lesbian, single mother and so on do not describe the complex and dynamic issues in women's lives and identities.

Critiquing bureaucracy, leadership, power, community. Schools constructed to build support and facilities for nurturing self-development, for relationship- and community-building around an ethic of care, with leaders working toward such purposes, build from the feminist critique (Noddings, 1988; Marshall, 1997; Marshall et al., 1996; Foster, 1986; Laible, 1997). Theorizing collaborative, shared, power-with (Arendt, 1972; Habermas, 1986; Ball, 1993) helps examine power exercised in diffuse, fragmented societies and power exercised as community- and relationship-building. Feminist perspectives, infusin an ethic of care and a belief that cooperation creates shared power that gets things done (Stone, 1989), expands the possibility that a social justice ethic could be incorporated into the notion of power as a force for good. In-depth case studies, e.g of urban principals (Dillard, 1995; Marshall, et al., 1996) or women teachers (Acker,

1995) allow exploration of expanded views of educators' work: their work is about creating opportunities to teach and about relationships and community, so models about traditional bureaucratic leadership and teaching skills have poor explanatory power. Think about the possibilities for reframing policy for teacher and administrator preparation, evaluations! Once the questions are widened to delve into making democracy and community real, and the master's tools/master's house critique is surfaced, what organizations and politics are still viable, once the status of women question has status?

EXPANDING RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES

The methodological approaches useful for asking feminist critical theory-driven questions include:

1. personal narratives and oral histories that interrupt imperialist gender regime theories and metanarratives; narratives for the stories/values of all stakeholders;
2. deconstruction of policy texts;
3. journals and life histories as data bases uncovering how policies affect self-identity negotiations.

Analysts' stance toward their endeavor can embrace precepts of interpretive, post-positivist, feminist to create new policy analysis traditions, include these challenges:

1. to construct research that creates a relationship with individuals and respects their meaning-making;
2. to be openly ideological and activist--writing and work against the grain;
3. to challenge metanarratives;
4. in every policy analysis and evaluation, in every policy formulation; to ask who benefits, who loses, and how do those usually silenced and marginalized fare?

Research agendas can include:

1. identifying policy agenda setting and its exclsionary effects;
2. backward mapping, to identify the gaps and policy slippage due to symbolic and simplistic policy formulation; and to seek actively how policies affect individuals' negotiations with identity, policies' effects on social justice goals;
3. Power as domination, but also resistance to power (the postmodern).
4. research on borderlands, the areas of silence and non-events, the counternarratives and counterpublics.
5. intersection of talk and the structures of power--talk is power; management of knowledge and language is an important site of political struggle.
6. subjectivity and identity negotiation, identity construction;
7. critiquing policy assumptions that embed private-public inconsistencies like welfare, abortion; policies' abilities to empower and support self-development; policies' abilities to support community and relationship-building and democratic ethos; recognizing the genderedness of organizations and careers and the power differentials and benefit/outcomes differences with attention to ethinicity, gender, race, national origin, disability.

For starters, we must ask gender questions about how power and privilege get reinforced and how people get silenced and disempowered. Questions to ask about any policy proposed to create gender equity could include:

1. How forceful is it?
2. Which feminisms?

Does it:

1. See sexism affecting males too?
2. Assume all women as one unit of analysis?
3. Incorporate ethnicity?
4. Focus on school environment?
5. Recognize schools' interconnections with other institutions?
6. Demand constant critical assessment, timelines?
7. Demand monitoring and reporting?
8. Deal with self-esteem?
9. Deal with women's ways of knowing and moral reasoning?
10. Deal with need for relationship, collaboration?
11. Deal with incorporating the private sphere?
12. Focus on only the high achievers?

How all-encompassing is it:

1. What mechanisms for reaching curriculum, program definition, training, finance, governance, buildings and facilities?
2. Does it acknowledge resistance to change and economic and political and historical contexts?
3. Who is the target audience?
4. Who carries the burden of implementation and are they capable?

Such methodologies, and questions, used in policy analysis, hold great promise and a long-missing agenda for education, asking widened questions with policy issues generated inclusivley.

Shaping the Future: Strengths, Limitations, Warnings[11]

In shaping these agendas, several cautions should be mentioned. The struggle of any oppressed group to "write against the grain" combines with feminisms' problems with elitism, blindness to class and race, middle class, heterosexual bias. But the challenge is too big and too important to expend energy on infighting.

Next, resist the tendency to essentialize, to accept analyses and policies that look at women as one unified category. Unless that separation is changed, liberal and critical theory allows women into the public sphere but still leaves women with all the duties of the private sphere (its fine if you want to be president as long as you can manage your family's needs for nurturance and support too.) A related question: would men's entry into feminist scholarship ruin it for women, in this social and political environment where men's voices are lent automatic power and legitimacy? [12] Yet, claiming female epistemological privilege, e.g. assuming that a woman's experience of marginality provides her automatically with different scientific insights,

can be a trap (Haste, 1994; Acker, 1994). The handy screwdriver in the master's toolbox is using that public-private dichotomy to discard responsibility for inequalities--declaring them as 'private-sphere'--not part of what formal insitutions and policies must address--thus allowing the dominant power arrangments to discriminate at will. Then, the marginalized may not complain--their discomfort, their sense that they must create passable identities--are labelled as personal and private problems. Thus, lesbians, other marginalized groups, other women, are explained away: 'oh, she has such a chip on her shoulder', or 'she really needs to keep her private problems out of the workplace'.

Feminist analysis often heats up gender tensions. It disturbs: "to argue that sexual domination is central to, though unacknowledged in, modern social and political theory, is to touch on some emotions, interests, and privileges very different from those disturbed by arguments about class" (Pateman, 1987, p. 2). No one likes to be called as "an oppressor, the enemy, collaborator, or bystander (however innocent) in discrimination or disadvantage" (Goodnow, 1985, p. 31) and no one likes a complainer. Men are uncomfortable with the thought that their advantages were not necessarily earned but rather bestowed by institutions and professions structured to support them.

Resist backsliding: it is easy to grab the masters' tools when feminist tools and women's ways are denigrated and we gain legitimacy only when we use the masters' discourse, the "appropriate" methods.

Similarly, we must watch for the gender effects of the array of reforms for schooling. For example, from feminist analysis we can inspect how "choice" and privatization arguments (see, for example Gender Justice, Kirp, 1985) and arguments for family values' inculcation have embedded agendas for controlling females' choices. Abstracted theorizing should not divert us from research and action for those "at-risk" females when policymakers cannot yet see the risks and waste of girls' possibilities in supposedly gender-neutral divorce laws which result in feminization of poverty, in government rulings that fail to see escaping genital mutilation as a rationale for political asylum for a woman, and in the Georgia school district refusing responsibility for protecting an elementary schoolgirl from five months of sexual harassment from a peer.

THE CHALLENGE FOR US HERE TODAY IS ESTABLISHED:

As Kuhn observed: 'Political revolutions aim to change political institutions in ways that those institutions themselves prohibit' (1970, p. 93).

When new programs, policies, and practices are constructed with women's voices and values, the approaches to analysis and evaluation may also need remodelling.

Is a transformed state, a different politics, possible? Must the state be smashed to make a feminist state conceivable? Feminist novelists' utopias, free of patriarchy, are science fiction worlds 'fundamentally different from our own, such as the hidden world without men in Herland'

(1990:537). An alternative is for educators and policy analysts to develop feminist and critical methods for identifying and engaging with expanded policy questions.[2]

[2]In *Quotable Women: A Collection of Shared Thoughts.* (Phildelphia: The Running Press; 1989)

Endnotes

1. Feminist theorists notice the values-bases of policy actors: policymakers debate on and on about, for example, abortion, without acknowledging that women are the only ones who have abortions. Feminists notice the assumptions about women (women's bodies, women's intuition, women's deficiencies, symbolic representations of women --as evil, as witchily powerful, as irrational--) are used to buttress societal, institutional, and political domination--as in women need to be controlled, to be helped, to be protected. Feminists notice the artificial separation of the spheres: public (political rights, citizenship, reasoned debate, contracts--the rational world and the proper concern for social and political theory) and private (emotion, love, partiality and particularity-the proper concern for the family, the domestic, the non-rational) spheres . And notice how that separation can be used to assert that women cannot be leaders, cannot attend prestigious military schools, that women need men in Senates to decide on definitions of sexual harassment and whether they need permission to have abortions).

2. See Bensimon and Marshall's Chapter One in Feminist Critical Policy Analysis (1997) Volume II for a presentation focused directly on feminist analysis.

3. In critical policy analysis, one asks: how does power and privilege get reinforced through political (and educational) institutions? and by what processes do the silenced and disempowered get kept in their place? Feminist critical policy analysis, focuses on women, adds postmodern insights, reinvents human agency, and recognizes that people can resist structures and that people negotiate their identities and choices while living with political and institutional forces (Marshall, 1997).

4. Dorothy Smith seeing everyday life as problematic and political (1981) and Jean-Bethke Elshtain bring the mothers searching for sons lost to terrorists (1982) as a focus for political scientists, are examples of this redefinition of what constitutes a political analysis.

5. For example, exploration of women's critique of assumptions of educational leadership--the career, the theory, and the practice--a counternarrative--holds promise for a reconcptualizing free of outdated male and managerial norms (benefitting man and women and children), as explicated in Marshall, 1995.

6. Policy choices reflect shifts in public values and the shifts (e.g. from to the shifts from valuing efficiency, to valuing choice, equity, and quality exemplified in the work of Callahan, 1962; Garms, Guthrie & Pierce, 1978; Marshall, Mitchell & Wirt, 1989; Clark & Astuto, 1986). However, by focusing on the dominant values recognized as winners in values conflicts, we assist in the exclusion of alternative values. When analysts of politics and policy focus on the policies that have the most support, they miss the values emerging in counterpublic arenas-- voices that pose alternative views, whether the alternative values are posed by philosophers like Maxine Greene, Jane Roland Martin, or Nell Noddings) or by educators/citizens/parents/children.

7. Fraser's definition of public sphere goes beyond government and includes anywhere where "political participation is enacted through the medium of talk" (1994, p. 111) --so it is not the economy, not just the legislature, it is a "theater for debating and deliberating(p. 111)--a place where participatory democracy can take place, but the ideal has degenerated because the public sphere has oppressive structures and unequal power relations within it.

8. Watching the U S Senate protect Senator Packwood for so long and grill Anita Hill makes one cynical about the will and capacity of government to upset itself over a "woman's issue."

9. Yates (1993) shows how the language of feminist politics is taken up but transformed and contained when it is made policy.

10. In her study of Canada's Royal Commission on the Status of Women, Trimble concluded: "when faced with demands for policy changes that fundamentally challenge the prevailing conception of gender roles, the federal government will conduct research and invoke non-coercive policy instruments" (Trimble, 1990, p. 41).

11. In this section I focus a great deal on cautions for women working the feminist agenda since our positions in adademia and policy arenas are so easily toppled. As Jean O'Barr (Marshall, O'Barr & Gerstl-Pepin, 1997) notes, one must try to separate the discriminations that are sexism from those that are just resistance to change. But the dismantler who is female is particularly vulnerable.

12. Connell (1987) has taken leadership; he lays out his feminist credentials as he introduces Gender and Power. And the Australian gender equity project's success may be attributed in part to its focus on the social construction of gender, thus including males' needs.

References

Acker, S. (Ed.). (1994). Gendered education: Sociological reflections of women, teaching and feminism. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Acker, S. (1995). Carry on caring: The work of women teachers. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 16(1), 21-36.

Anderson, C. W. (1978). The logic of public problems: Evaluations in comparative policy research. In Ashford (Ed.), Comparing public policies: New concepts and methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Anderson, G. L. (1989). Critical ethnography in education: Origins, current status, and new directions. Review of Educational Research, 59(3), 249-270.

Apple, M. (1994). Texts and contexts: The state and gender in educational policy. Curriculum Inquiry, 24(3), 349-359.

Arendt, H. (1972). On violence. Crisis of the republic. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovitch.

Arnot, M., & Weiler, K. (Eds.). (1993). Feminism and social justice in education: International perspectives. London: Falmer Press.

Ball, S. (1990). Politics and policy making in education: Explorations in policy sociology. London: Routledge.

Ball, T. (1993). New faces of power. In T. Wartenberg (Ed.), Rethinking power. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Biklen, S. K. (1995). School work: Gender and the cultural construction of teaching. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Blackmore, J. (1989). Educational leadership: A feminist critique and reconstruction. In J. Smythe (Ed.), Critical perspectives on educational leadership. New York: Falmer Press.

Blackmore, J. (1995). Policy as dialogue: Feminist administrators working for educational change. Gender and Education, 7(3), 293-313.

Boneparth, E., & Stoper, E. (1988). Women, power, and policy: Toward the year 2000. (2nd ed.). Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.

Callahan, R. E. (1962). Education and the cult of efficiency: A study of the social forces that have shaped the administration of public schools. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Clark, D. C., Astuto, T. A. (1986). The significance and permanence of changes in federal education policy. Educational Researcher, 15(8), 4-13.

Cockburn, C. (1991). In the Way of Women: Men's resistance to sex equality in organizations. Basingstoke: MacMillan.

Connell, R. W. (1987). Gender and power. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

DeHaven-Smith, L. (1988). Philosophical critiques of policy analysis: Lindblom, Habermas, and the Great Society. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press.

DeLeon, P. (1988). Advice and consent: The development of the policy sciences. New York, NY: Russell Sage.

Dillard, C. B. (1995). Leading with her life: An African American feminist (re)interpretation of leadership for an urban high school principal. Educational Administration Quarterly, 31(4), 539-563.

Dryzek, J. S., & Bobrow, D. B. (1987). Policy analysis by design. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Eisenstein, H. (1993). A telling tale from the field. In J. Blackmore & J. Kenway (Eds.), Gender matters in educational administration and policy. (pp. 1-8). London: Falmer Press.

Elshtain, J. B. (1982). Feminist discourse and its discontents: Language, power, and meaning. In N. Keohane, M. Z. Rosaldo, & B. C. Gelpi (Eds.), Feminist theory: A critique of ideology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Faludi, S. (1991). Backlash: The undeclared war against American women. New York: Crown Press.

Ferguson, K. E. (1984). The feminist case against bureaucracy. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Fischer, F. (1989). Beyond the rationality project: Policy analysis and the postpositivist challenge. Policy Studies Journal, 17, 941-951.

Forester, J. (1993). Critical theory, public policy, and planning practice: Toward a critical pragmatism. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Foster, M. (1993). Othermothers: Exploring the educational philosophy of black American women teachers. In M. Arnot & K. Weiler (Eds.), Feminism and social justice in education: International perspectives. (pp. 101-123). Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press.

Foster, W. (1986). Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

Foucault, M. (1981). The order of discourse. In R. Young (Ed.), Untying the text. . London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Fraser, N. (1994). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), Habermas and the public sphere. (pp. 109-142). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Garms, W., Guthrie, J., & Pierce, L. (1978). School finance: The economics and politics of education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Giroux, H. A. (1992). Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education. New York: Routledge.

Glazer, J. S. (1991). Feminism and professionalism in teaching and educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 27(3), 321-342.

Goodnow, E., & Pateman, C. (Eds.). (1985). Women, social science, and public policy. Wincester, MA: Allen and Unwin.

Habermas, J. (1986). Hannah Arendt's communications concept of power. In S. Lukes (Ed.), Power. NY, NY: New York University Press.

Harding, S. (1986). The science question in feminism. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Haste, H. (1994). The sexual metaphor. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kahne, J. (1994). Democratic communities, equity, and excellence: A Deweyan reframing of educational policy analysis. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 16(3), 233-248.

Kingdon, J. W. (1984). Agendas, alternatives, and public policies. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Kirp, D. (1985). Gender justice. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Klein, S. (1988). Using sex equity research to improve educational policies. Theory into Practice, 2(2), 152-160.

Kuhn, T. S. (1970). The structure of scientific revolutions. (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Laible, J. (1997). Feminist analysis of sexual harassment policy: A critique of the ideal of community. In C. Marshall (Ed.), Critical policy analysis: Dismantling the master's house (Vol. I,). London: Falmer.

MacKinnon, C. A. (1989). Toward a feminist theory of the state. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Marshall, C. (1985). The stigmatized woman: The professional woman in a male sex-typed career. Journal of Educational Administration, 23(2), 132-152.

Marshall, C. (1995). Imagining leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 31(3), 484-492.

Marshall, C. (1997a). Dismantling and reconstructing policy analysis. In C. Marshall (Ed.), Feminist critical policy analysis: A perspective from secondary schooling (Vol. I,). London: Falmer.

Marshall, C. (Ed.). (1997b). Feminist critical policy analysis: A perspective from post-secondary education. (Vol. II). London: The Falmer Press.

Marshall, C. (1997c). Undomesticated gender policy. In B. J. Banks & P. M. Hall (Eds.), Gender, equity, and schooling . New York: Garland Publishing Co.

Marshall, C., & Anderson, G. (1995). Rethinking the private and public spheres: Feminist and Cultural Studies Perspectives on the Politics of Education. In J. A. L. Scribner, Don (Ed.), The study of educational politics . London: Falmer Press.

Marshall, C., Mitchell, D., & Wirt, F. (1989). Culture and education policy in the American states. London: Falmer Press.

Marshall, C., O'Barr, J., & Gerstl-Pepin, C. (1997). Legitimacy maintenance: The politics of Women's Studies. In C. Marshall (Ed.), Feminist critical policy analysis: A perspective from post-secondary education. (Vol. II,). London: Falmer Press.

Marshall, C., Rogers, D., Steele, J., & Patterson, J. (1996). Caring as career: An alternative model for educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 32(2), 271-294.

Noddings, N. (1988). An ethic of caring and its implications for American education. American Journal of Education, 96(2), 215-230.

Ortiz, F. I., & Marshall, C. (1988). Women in school administration. In N. Boyan (Ed.), Review of research in educational administration. New York: Longman.

Pateman, C., & Gross, E. (Eds.). (1987). Feminist challenges: Social and political theory. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Rein, M. (1983). Value-critical policy analysis. In Callahan & Jennings (Eds.), Ethics, the social sciences and policy analysis. New York: Plenum Press.

Roe, E. M. (1989). Narrative analysis for the policy analyst: A case study of the 1980-1982 medfly controversy in California. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 8(2), 251-273.

Sadker, M., Sadker, D., & Steindam, S. (1989). Gender equity and educational reform. Educational Leadership, 46(6), 44-47.

Scheurich, J. (1994). Policy Archeology: A new Policy Studies Methodology. Journal of Education Policy, 9(4), 297-316.

Schram, S. F. (1995). Against policy analysis: Critical reason and poststructural resistance. Policy Sciences, 28(4), 375-384.

Smith, D. (1981). The experienced world as problematic: A feminist method. Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan.

Stone, C. (1989). Regime politics: Governing Atlanta, 1946-88. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Tetrault, M., & Schmuck, P. (1985). Equity, educational reform and gender. Issues in Education, 3, 64.

Trimble, L. (1990). Towards transformation: Women, politics and public policy in Canada: Text for Political Science 350.

Weiler, K. (1993). Feminism and the struggle for a democratic education: A view from the states. In M. Arnot & K. Weiler (Eds.), Feminism and social justice in education: International perspectives. . Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press.

Weis, L. (1995). Gender and the reports: The case of the missing piece. In M. A. P. Ginsberg (Ed.), Commissions, reports, reforms, and educational policy (pp. 173-192). Westport Ct: Praeger.

Yates, L. (1993). What happens when feminism is an agenda of the state? Feminist theory and the case of education policy in Australia. Discourse: The Australian Journal of Educational Studies, 14(1), 17-29.